

Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

D6.2 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid



1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)		D5.2 Funding Opportunities			Date	31/12/2021	
WP 5	Task 5.2: Funding Opportunities				Task Leader	LLL-P	
Author(s)	Erika Somlyay (LLL-P)						
Quality assurance Reviewer			Remigio Berruto		Partner	UNITO	
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Comments/Remarks ¹		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X		
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X		
The information addressed the key issues					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X		
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	

¹ In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.

² In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	
The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	
The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:			
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	
Date of Quality Assurance review		14/01/2022			
Signature: <i>Remigio Berruto</i>					

Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)		D5.2 Funding opportunities			Date	20/12/2021
WP	5				Task Leader	LLLP
Author(s)		Erika Somlyay (LLLP)				
Quality assurance Reviewer		Luis Mayor			Partner	ISEKI
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Comments/Remarks ¹	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements					Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	
The information addressed the key issues					Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²					Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	

¹ In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.

² In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	
The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:			
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	
Date of Quality Assurance review		11/01/2022			
Signature:					

Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

D6.2 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid



1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable		D5.2	Date		13/01/2022
WP	Long term action plan		Task Leader		Lifelong Learning Platform
Author(s)	Dionysios Bochtis				
Quality assurance Reviewer		Efthymios Rodias		Partner	CERTH
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form			Comments/Remarks ¹		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements			Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The information addressed the key issues			Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²			Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

¹ In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.






² In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format			Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The Deliverable is written in good English			Comments/Remarks The English language should be revised.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Deliverable has been released by its due date			Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Date of Quality Assurance review		13/01/2022		
Signature:				

2 The grading system

The grading system included in the Evaluation Grid template (Annex I) provides a quick overview of the main conclusions at the level of each assessment question. A five-grade scale is adopted using the following categories (Table 1):

Table 1. Grading reference table.

Score	Grading reference table for assessing and monitoring questions
	I disagree = 1: There are deficiencies which are serious. If not addressed, they may lead to failure of the Deliverable. Major adjustments and revision of the intervention logic and/or implementation arrangements are necessary.
	I slightly disagree = 2: There are issues which need to be addressed. Necessary improvements do not, however, require a major revision of the intervention logic and implementation arrangements.
	Neutral = 3: The situation is considered satisfactory, but there may be room for improvement. Recommendations are useful, but not vital to the project or programme.
	I agree = 4: All issues within the scope of the project have been fairly addressed. Authors have answered any requirement stated in the Task description, reaching the intended objectives. There is no request for further improvements gathered in the evaluation process.
	I completely agree = 5: The Deliverable quality goes beyond the expected quality standards reported in the Quality assurance procedure, leading to an outstanding standard. Authors did not confine the activity implementation to the proposal description, but they have contingently approached the task by considering any additional information arising during the project development. The delivery deadline has been met.

Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

D5.2 -

Funding Opportunities



1 : Funding Opportunities

Deliverable (Evaluation Grid)		D5.2 Funding Opportunities		Date	20/12/2021
WP 5	Task 5.2: Funding Opportunities			Task Leader	LLLP
Author(s)		Erika Somlyay (LLLP)			
Quality assurance Reviewer		Marg Leijdens, Jan Gundeleach		Partner	Aeres
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form				Comments/Remarks ¹	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The information addressed the key issues				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	

¹ In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.

² In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	x 	
The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	x 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	x 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:			
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	x 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Date of Quality Assurance review		14/01/2022			
Signature:					